Document 78

Filed 12/04/2007

Page 1 of 4

Case 4:06-cv-07339-CW

Pursuant to the Court's scheduling order dated November 2, 2007, the parties jointly submit this Case Management Statement.

I. Status of Litigation.

All Defendants have substantially completed production of hard copy documents, and the KM Defendants have been producing electronically stored information (ESI) on a rolling basis. Plaintiffs continue to review documents as they are produced, and the parties continue to meet and confer regarding various discovery matters, particularly documents withheld on the basis of attorney-client privilege.

Pursuant to the scheduling order issued August 30, 2007, production of all documents and ESI was to be completed by November 7, 2007. The KM Defendants submitted a case management statement requesting a one-month extension on October 29, 2007. Plaintiffs submitted a case management statement requesting that, if the Court decided to grant the KM Defendants' request, a concomitant extension of the other deadlines in the case also be granted, so that Plaintiffs would not be unfairly burdened with reviewing ESI in a significantly shortened timeframe.

On November 2, 2007, the Court issued an order vacating the case management conference set for November 5, and rescheduling it to December 11. The parties have operated on the assumption that by that order, the Court granted the KM Defendants' request for a one-month extension of the deadline to complete document production. However, the order did not explicitly address whether the other case deadlines would be adjusted. The KM Defendants expect to complete their production of ESI in response to Plaintiffs' requests for production of documents by the December 7 deadline. Defendant North Star Trust Company's production of ESI will be fully completed by the December 7 deadline.

As noted in the previous joint case management statement, all parties agree that for the sake of efficiency, Plaintiffs should not take depositions until after Plaintiffs have had a sufficient opportunity to review the documents and ESI produced in response to their document requests. If Plaintiffs take depositions without such an opportunity, witnesses may need to be deposed more than once, increasing the inconvenience and expense for all involved. Although at the time that

this Statement is being submitted, the KM Defendants and Defendant North Star Trust Co. have not yet completed their production of ESI, when their ESI production is completed, the K-M Defendants expect to have produced approximately 8000 electronic documents and Defendant North Star Trust Co. expects to have produced hundreds of electronic documents.

The parties agree that Plaintiffs' opportunity to review the documents should not be compromised as a result of the fact that Defendants did not complete production within the timeframe imposed at the last status conference.

Therefore, Plaintiffs request and Defendants do not oppose that the Court adopt the following proposed schedule, wherein all of the dates are moved in conjunction with the extension granted to the KM Defendants.

II. Proposed Schedule.

In light of the issues outlined in the prior section, the parties jointly propose the following schedule to govern the remainder of this litigation:

1. Deadline for production of ESI and hard copy December 7, 2007 15 documents by all Defendants. 16 2. Close of fact discovery May 23, 2008 Deadline for hearings on motions for class July 29, 2008 17 certification and for summary judgment on statute of limitations grounds 18 Disclosure of identity of experts and exchange of October 10, 2008 19 expert reports 5. Deadline for rebuttal expert reports October 31, 2008 20 6. Close of expert discovery (depositions) November 21, 2008 21 7. Deadline for hearing on dispositive motions January 6, 2009 22 8. Pretrial Conference February 24, 2009 9. Trial date March 16, 2009 23

Dated: December 4, 2007 Respectfully submitted,

LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.

By: /s/ Daniel Feinberg

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

26

27

28

	Case 4:06-cv-07339-CW	Document 78	Filed 12/04/2007 Page 4 of 4	
1			Peter Rukin – CA State Bar No. 178	3336
2			RUKIN HYLAND DORIA & TINDALL LLP	,550
3			Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
4 5			and the Proposed Class	
6	Dated: December 4, 200	7	LOVITT & HANNAN, INC.	
7		 By:	: /s/	
8		•	Henry Bornstein Attorneys for Defendant K-M Indus	tries
9			Holding Co., Inc.; K-M Industries F Co., Inc. ESOP Plan Committee; an ESOP Plan Committee	Holding ad CIG
10			ESOP Plan Committee	
11	Dated: December 4, 2007		HENNIGAN, BENNETT & DORN	IAN LLP
12	_			
13 14		By:	Robert L. Palmer	and
15			Attorneys for Defendant William E. Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust; B. Moore Revocable Trust; William	Desiree
16			Moore Marital Trust; William E. ar Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust	
17			Generation-Skipping Trust; and De Moore	siree
18				
19	Dated: December 4, 2007	<u> </u>	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS I	LP
20		By:	: _/s/_	
21		,	Nicole Diller Attorneys for Defendant North Star	Trust
22			Company	
23				
2425				
26				
27				
28				
		- 3	3 - JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT ST	CATEMENT